

## REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing claim amendments will result in claims 1-5 and 7-21 being pending; of these 20 claims, only claim 1 is independent, and none are presented in multiple dependent form; accordingly, no extra claim fees (total, independent or multiple dependency) are believed to be due.

The enclosed substitute specification (and marked-up version) includes numerous amendments to the specification and abstract.<sup>1</sup> Many are directed to providing a text that employs English terminology and phrasing that is more idiomatic, and others are directed at addressing the informality issues addressed on page 2 of the 7/17 Action; no explicit textual support is believed necessary for these. Support for the remaining textual amendments is believed to be self-evident, and the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned directly with any specific questions. To the best of the undersigned's understanding of the invention, these changes introduce no new matter into the application.

Regarding the claim support issue set forth at page 2 of the 7/17 Action, Applicant submits that Tables A and B provide essentially literal support for original claims 1-9, so reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. (As with the foregoing, textual support for the amended claims also is believed to be self-evident, but the examiner again is invited to contact the undersigned with any specific questions.)

Original claims 1 and 6 were rejected as anticipated by or obvious over any of a variety of references. Claim 6 has been canceled, so that rejection has been obviated. Claim 1 has been amended to specify the types of inhibiting additives present in the composition; none of the cited references are submitted to teach or suggest claim 1 as presently presented. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully solicited.

Original claims 7-9 were allowed, and original claims 2-5 were objected to solely because they depended from a rejected claim. The foregoing amendments should not affect the acknowledged patentability of claims 7-9, each of which now depends from

---

<sup>1</sup> Because the abstract required amendment, both the substitute specification and the marked-up version include three pages of as-filed claims. These claim pages are included merely so that placement and numbering of the abstract will be proper. The Listing of Claims included with this response, which amends the as-filed claims, is the set that should be examined.

claim 16. Additionally, claims 2-5 provide additional patentable distinctions beyond that of independent claim 1.

Continued examination and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Inquiries concerning this submission specifically, as well as the application in general, should be directed to the attention of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Burleson, Reg. No. 38,090  
Attorney for Applicant

December 31, 2008

ZOLLINGER & BURLESON LTD.  
Post Office Box 2368  
Canton, Ohio 44720-0368

phone: 330/526-0104, x2  
facsimile: 866/311-9964